

BESS o' Bedlam's

L O V E

TO HER

BROTHER TOM:

With a Word in behalf of

Poor Brother BEN HOADLY.



LONDON:

Printed and Sold by the Booksellers of
 London and Westminster. 1709.

Dear Brother Tom,

ALTHO I love Brother *Ben* as well as any Sister he has, yet I cannot chuse but send you my Love and Thanks for bestowing a good chiding upon him in your last Letter which you wrote in behalf of the Bishop to *Ben*. If he had not been a Madman, he would never have thought upon so wild a Fancy, as that of contradicting a Bishop, who preach'd before the Queen upon the Day of her Majesty's happy Accession to her Throne, and all this only for the Truth. Is Truth to be spoke at all times? Or do all People think themselves bound to speak Truth at Court? These are fine times of Liberty, when a Priest shall take upon him to contradict a Bishop; for do not you, and I, and all Lay-People, who are not bred up to Book-Learning, believe in the Bishops? Have we any foundation to ground our holy Faith upon besides the Bishops Bible? 'Twere the Bishops alone (as I have heard) who, in King *James* the First's Reign, translated the holy Bible into *English*; or else you and I had been as Ignorant of the true Religion as *Papists* or *Essex* Calves: And this always made me hate the *Presbyterians* for their foolish quarrelling with the Bishops, when at the same time they are not capable to understand any thing of the *Christian* Religion, but what they must learn from the Bishops Bible. Now tho Brother *Ben* can believe in the *Greek* Testament, yet if he does not understand *Hebrew*, he cannot believe in the Old Testament, without the help of the Bishops Translation. So that, I say, that he is a Madman to contradict a Bishop; for hereby he (as much as him lies) shakes the Faith of us poor Lay-People: for if Scholars will not allow that Bishops interpret the Holy Scriptures rightly, how shall we Lay-Folks know that they translated rightly? Can *Ben* think that any body will be such a Fool as to believe him before a Bishop? I mean as to the Interpretation of the Scriptures: for I own that any body may understand common Sense as well as some Bishops; for common Sense does belong to common People, but Bishops are the highest Divines, and this Bishop is far from being one of the lowest Churchmen, and therefore *Ben* should have kept his Distance.

But

But for all this I should be sorry he should incur the Displeasure of the High Church, by venting his low-priz'd Theology; and therefore the occasion of my writing to you is to desire you to use your Interest with the Bishop (in whose behalf you wrote your Book) to reconcile him to *Ben*, and to make up Matters between 'em. You know that when Men are provok'd, they are apt to harbour Jealousys, and give ear to Misrepresentations. And I am confident that *Ben* was slander'd by those who told the Bishop, that *Ben* had a grudge at his Lordship, because the good Queen made him a Bishop; the Bishop alledges this fault against *Ben*, in the ninth Page of his Answer. A Now, dear Brother, I desire that you would pacify the Bishop to this Point, and tell his Lordship, that *Ben* is so far from quarrelling with the Office of Bishops and Ecclesiastical Governors, that he would be contented to be a Church-Governor of a whole Diocese himself, if the Queen should think fit to promote him to such an Office: and tho I hope better of him, yet 'tis possible that he may, like some others, preach for Liberty while a Presbyter, and for Passive-Obedience at Court when a Bishop. But if he should continue to be honest after he is prefer'd, I dare say that he would preach, and promote Obedience to the Queen's Government, and every legal Administration under her Majesty, as heartily as any Bishop of them all; Neither would he encourage or foster his Clergy to disparage the sound Revolution-Principles, upon which her Majesty's Accession, and the Protestant Succession to the *Britannick* Throne are founded, and the Pretender excluded. He would boldly hold forth to his Diocese, that Self-defence against Oppression is not only lawful, but necessary for the sake of our selves and Posterity, and thereby fairly justify the happy Revolution, and shut the Back-Door against the Pretender. He would scorn to be so cautious or self-designing, as to avoid all Discourse about Self-Defence, as if it were so dangerous a Doctrine as might betray Men into a State of Damnation: or if he thought such a necessary Defence to be a damnable Sin, he would not trim the Matter, so as neither to allow or disallow it, but would boldly warn the People to repent of it, lest they all likewise perish. Had he been Bishop of *Exeter* when the Prince of *Orange* came thither, he would not have ran away from him, as the then Bishop did; neither would he have stood between hawk and buzzard, as another Bishop now does. He would not

have slunk his Neck out of the Collar, and said, ' Have a care
 ' what you do Neighbours, for Self-defence is a dangerous
 ' thing, and for ought I know you may be damn'd for it : how-
 ' ever do as you please, I will not meddle nor make. All that
 ' I say in the matter is, that God has given the King full power
 ' over the Lives of all his Subjects, so that God has made him
 ' the higher Power. And St. Paul has said, *That he that resists*
 ' *the higher Power, shall receive to himself Damnation.* Yet
 ' I will not take upon me to say, whether in this Case you may
 ' or may not defend your selves, and accept of the Prince of
 ' Orange's Assistance. But, however, do as you will, 'tis all
 ' one to me whether you be damn'd or no, so as you save my
 ' Bishoprick for me, and will not take it amiss that I shall never
 ' acknowledge that you did well in it, nor ever give you Thanks
 ' for your Pains? Ben would have been hang'd before he would
 have trim'd at such a half-fac'd Bromigham rate; but by his Ex-
 hortation and Example would have encourag'd the Revolution.
 But I heard one say the other day, that Brother Ben had not the
 Ear-mark of the Spirit of *West-Country* Episcopacy.

But to proceed (Brother Tom) the main point between the
 Bishop and Brother Ben, is about the Power of the Supreme Ma-
 gistrate over the Lives of the Subject, whether this Power be
 from Heaven or of Men. The Bishop says, that this Power is
 given by God only, and proves it from several Texts of Scrip-
 ture, wherein 'tis said, that *the Powers that be are ordain'd of*
God. But because the Ordination of God does oftentimes signify
 no more than the subsistence of something by Divine Providence,
 by which Usurpers and Tyrants do sometimes bear rule in the
 World without any Commission from God, or else that it is
 God's Will that there should be Government; therefore the Bi-
 shop enters into the Reason of the thing, p. 33. of his Answer,
 where he writes, that *tho as the World now is, there is ground*
enough for the distinction between the natural and political Ca-
capacity of a Subject, and between Paternal (he might has well
have said Maternal) and Civil Government, yet from the begin-
ning it was not so; for then I believe the same first Man who was
Father, was also Civil Governor of all his Children : he had (I
verily believe) as much the Power of a Civil Governor, as any
King has now. And the Bishop declares, *That now the Civil*
Governors have power over the Lives of their Subjects: which
 Power

Powe he says is given to them by God, because Men cannot dispose of their own Lives. Neither has a Malefactor condemn'd to die, any more Power over his own Life than over another's. Now on the other hand, *Ben* is understood by the Bishop to say, that the People make a King, by giving him power over their own Lives, which they cannot give; and without which Power no Man is a King, as the Bishop supposes. And this being the great Point in Dispute between them, I had a great mind to be satisfy'd in the Matter: and therefore I consider'd of it first by my ownself. And, 1st. Thought I, 'tis not necessary that the Supreme Magistrate should have Power over the Lives of his Subjects: for supposing that the Legislature of any Country should think that Fines, bodily Pains, Imprisonment and Banishment should be sufficient to preserve the Government, and should enact no other Penalties; in that Case the Supreme Magistrate would have no Power of Life. And supposing that in a certain sense the Power of Life be in the Queen's Majesty, she can derive it only from the Law, which she and the People make; who could as well have enacted other Punishments as those which are capital, and consequently the Power of Life and Death is not necessary to the Supreme Magistrate; but when he has it, 'tis deriv'd from the Legislature. 2. Thought I, what Power is it that Parents either have, or would willingly have over the Lives of their Children? You know (*Tom*) that my Daughter *Bess* is as unlucky a Girl as ever was born; and since Nature is the same now as ever it was, I conceive that I am as much a Queen and natural Governor over my *Bess* (especially now my Husband is dead) as ever King *Adam* or King *Noah* was over their Children. Now 'twas but last Week that this wicked Girl brake my new Looking-Glass, which was given me by my new Sweetheart; and the reason why she made this Battery upon the Glass, was only because I woud not give her a piece of white Bread which I had broke for her Brother. This crossness of hers provok'd me extremely, and I bang'd her Back sufficiently, but had not the least thought of taking away her Life: And if God Almighty should have come to me then, and said, *Bess o' Bedlam*, I give you Power over the Life of your naughty Daugther to do what you will with her, I should not have accepted of such a Power, Nor can I think that God Almighty ever offer'd such a Power to King *Adam* or King *Noah* over the Lives of their

Children: 'tis such a horrid shocking Power, it turns my Head to think of it. 'Tis not fit for God to give, nor Parents to take; and there I do not think that the Bishop uses God Almighty civilly, to say, that he gives such awkward Powers to poor Parents (who can think of nothing more than how to preserve their poor Children) and founds all Civil Government upon such Powers.

Now tho this Consideration satisfy'd me well enough, yet I was willing to know the Opinions of other People upon the same Subject; and to be very nice in the matter, I inquir'd again into two Particulars: (1.) Whether Supreme Magistrates have indeed Power over the Lives of their Subjects. And, (2.) If they have so, how they came by it. The first Man I apply'd to was the Historiographer Royal, who some years since wrote a Book about all the Governments in *Europe*; and he said that none of the Princes in *Europe* had any such Power, or pretended to have any, saving only the *Great Turk*. Said he, did ever any body hear our good Queen say, that the Lives of her Subjects were at her Disposal? Nay the *French King* himself, tho he makes bold with the Purses of his Subjects, and presses them to serve in the Wars, yet he leaves the Lives of his People to be dispos'd of by Judges and Officers, appointed to administer the Laws of his Country. Indeed the King of *Turkey* will sometimes send two Mute-Officers with a Bow-string to strangle any Subject given them in charge, whenever they meet with him. But the Historiographer Royal protested, that he could not find that God gave him any such Power; but that he took it up, and exercis'd it of his own accord.

After this I consulted our mad Lawyer, stating this Case between the Bishop and Brother *Ben* to him as well as I could; but he fell a raving on Brother *Ben's* side against the Bishop, saying, that *Robin Redbreast* made *Blackbreast* a—— that by upholding the Doctrine of Passive Obedience to the Will of a Prince, he might cast a slur upon the Justice of the late happy Revolution, and make void the Principle upon which it was grounded: And what turn could be serv'd by such Doctrines, which cast an Oidium upon the Revolution, but only that of the Pretender? And if the Principle which brought about the Revolution be unjust, all that is built upon it will be so too; the Act of Settlement and Succession will fall to the Ground. God be thank'd, said he, that the preaching of this Doctrine can sow no Seeds of Discontent.

Discontent between the Queen and her People, who will never believe that her Majesty has any Inclination to strain the Prerogative above the Law ; yet methinks (said he) 'tis time to forbear insisting so much upon this Doctrine, because 'tis very well known what great occasion it once did give to the Jealousys and Fears of the People of Great Britain, whereby a bloody Civil War was rais'd, which ended in the Destruction of King Charles the First, and the English Constitution both of State and Church. And 'twas from the same Doctrine, which was cultivated with great Diligence in the Reign of King Charles the Second, that the Papists drew Encouragement to withdraw the Royal Favour from the legal Establishments of this Nation ; which occasion'd the Misfortune of another Sovereign Prince, who was naturally a Man of great Justice and Virtue. 'Tis enough for one Doctrine to have subverted the English Constitution twice in one Century of Years ; but that this Engine should be kept on work from Age to Age, is insupportable.

But (said he) tho these *Laudean* Doctors cannot make the People jealous of the good Queen, yet they may by this Doctrine insinuate into the Queen a Distrust of her People's Fidelity and Duty to her Majesty ; as if there were such a Faction in the Kingdom, who conceive that they may call her to account for her Administration. Now there is no foundation for a Jealousy of this nature : For as the Body of the People of England have shewn by their Practice, that they will rise up in their own behalf, and defend themselves against the illegal Administration of their Supreme Magistrate, as appear'd by a late Instance, in which Tories and Whigs (as the word was then) both agreed, except only a very small number ; so on the other hand, 'twill be hard to find any Man of Consideration, who thinks that the People have any coercive Power over the Person of the Prince, upon any account whatever ; there being no Law which supports any such Power. Such a Power as this is contrary to the very Idea of Monarchy. Has Brother Ben or any other wrote any thing to this purpose these threescore years past ? 'Tis true, King Charles the First was call'd to Trial before a pretended Court of High Commission ; but the whole Nation have own'd that Trial to have been unwarrantable by any Law or Custom of this Land, and 'twill be a great difficulty to find a Man of any other Mind. I cannot think that there is one Man in this Land

who will justify that Trial; what occasion then had the Bishop to talk of Levellers, and to call *Ben* a Leveller?

The People of *Great Britain* haven chosen Monarchy to be their Form of Government, and for the sake of that Form they do not think themselves oblig'd to insist upon the rigour of that Law of God, which the Bishop alledges for the Establishment of Magistracy, *viz. He who sheds Man's Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed*; for tho the Supreme Magistrate should shed the Blood of any Man, yet our Constitution will not permit that his Blood may be shed by any Man. Besides (said he) it never enters into the Heads of the common People to examine nicely into the Forms of that Government under which they live; but if the end of Government be answer'd by protecting them in their Property, they find no fault with their Governors.

If all this be true (said I) as I think it is, then the Bishop has carry'd his Point against *Ben*; for this Doctrine is all which the Bishop contends for in his Sermon, and his Answer to *Ben*. I am not of your Opinion, said the Lawyer; for the Bishop has not prov'd that God did prescribe the Form of Monarchy. And since the Forms of Monarchy in *Europe* differ from each other in some particular Circumstances and Lodgments of Power, 'tis evident that the People of each respective Nation model'd their Governments according to their own Genius, and as suited best to their respective Interests and Inclinations. And whereas he says, that God gives the Supreme Magistrate Power over the Lives of Malefactors, 'tis no such thing. You may remember *Bess* (said he) that one of your Acquaintance was hang'd last Sessions for House-breaking; pray you, who took away his Life? *Jack Catch*, said I. And who gave *Jack Catch* the Power? The *Sheriff*, said I. And who gave the *Sheriff* that Power? The Judge and Jury, who found him guilty and condemn'd him. But, said he, who gave the Judge and Jury that Power? Was it the Queen or the Law? This was a hard Question, and I told him I could not answer it. Then (said he) 'twas the Law which made House-breaking capital, and gave both Judge and Jury Power to try and to condemn him. The Queen gave my Lord Chief Justice a Commission, by virtue whereof he sat as Judge; but even that Power of the Queen is by Law establish'd; and so it was agreed in the Constitution of the *English* Government. I cannot say that this was the original Constitution, because I have read that heretofore the

the Lords of Mannors appointed their Stewards to try and condemn Malefactors taken within their respective Mannors, and to order their Execution accordingly. Which, by the way, shews that the Regal Authority in *England* was more likely to be founded, as to this point, in the Power of a Landlor over his Tenants, than in the Power of a Parent over his Children. And at this time, when Malefactors are hang'd with royal Pardons in their pockets, as in Cases of Appeal, it shews the Law to be the Supreme Disposer of the Subjects Lives.

Now Brother *Tom*, if you think that Men may make Laws, that such and such Offences shall be capital, and also that God made the Men who made those Laws, you will then have some ground to go upon, in labouring a Reconciliation between the Bishop and *Ben*. For all that, *Ben* said, was, That the People gave the Power over Life to the Supreme Magistrate; which you see may be done, by enacting that such Offences shall be capital and such Persons commission'd by the Queen shall try and condemn 'em, with the Consent of a Jury. But since God made the Men who made these Laws, it may in that sense be said that God gave the Queen Power to commission Judges. Prithee *Tom* make up the matter between 'em; the difference is not much, and the thing can be no otherwise. For Mens Lives cannot honestly be taken away, but according to Law: so that it is very plain, that the Legislative Power is the Fountain of the Judicial Power; and so the Queen is the Fountain of Justice, in appointing Magistrates to put the Laws in execution.

But, *Tom*, before you can make up this difference fully and wholly, it will be very necessary for you to let his Lordship know, that Arguments cannot be form'd from mere Words, without affixing some Meaning to them. For thus, he argues with *Ben*: Pray, good Sir, where have I interpreted those words of the Apostle? I only barely cite the words, I only simply affirm that the Position before mention'd is directly contrary to them: And that the Reader may the better judge whether it be so or not, I will here present the matter to him in another view.

Rom. 13. 1.

There is no Power but of God:
The Powers that be, are ordain'd of God.

The Position.

The Sovereign Power of the Supreme Magistrate is deriv'd to him from the Aggregate Body of the People, as by their Grant or Concession.

If

If the Reader does not see a Contradiction between these two Assertions, I cannot help his Eye-sight nor his Understanding. I make no gloss at all upon the Text; I give no study'd or elaborate Interpretation of it. Thus says the Bishop, p. 18, of his Answer. Now I say, that upon supposition that no Meaning is to be fix'd upon the Apostle's words, Ben's words do not contradict 'em: nor can any words be found out which can contradict 'em. For Contradiction is not to be found in mere words, but in the Meaning of words; that is, in things, or at least our Ideas of things. So that till the Bishop sets forth in what sense Powers are ordain'd of God, he cannot say that Ben's Doctrine is disagreeable to that of the Apostle. Tell him, Tom, that 'tis below his Lordship's Character to give words, or to raise a dispute about mere words: Tell him too, that Ben will not stand with him for words: Nay, tell him that his Lordship cannot put any Sense upon those words of St. Paul, but what will fall in with Ben's Position. For if he means by those words, that the Persons of Magistrates are nam'd by God, 'tis false in fact; for God names no Magistrates. If he means that God gives the Powers, tho Men name the Persons, 'tis as false; for no Magistrate has any Power, but what the Legislative (which every where is the Representative of the Community) thinks fit to give him. And then there remains no other Sense of St. Paul's words, but that 'tis the Will of God that there should be Government. But this being a matter of the greatest importance, I will consider these words again, only with relation to the State of Great Britain.

Now the word *Powers* in the Text does not signify the Lodgment, or, as I may say, the Disposal of the several Parts of Sovereign Authority in the Kingdom of Great Britain. The Parts of Sovereign Power, taken by themselves, are the Legislative, the Executive, the Power of War and Peace, and the last Appeal in all Law-Suits. The first of these Powers is lodg'd in the Queen, Lords, and Commons. The Executive is lodg'd in the Queen; but so limited by the Legislative, that the Queen can imploy no Man in Civil or Military Trust, but such who is qualify'd according to the Laws of the Land. The Power of War and Peace is in the Queen: but if she wants the Purse of the Nation to support her in her War, she must apply to the House of Commons. The last Appeal in Law-Cases is made to the House of Lords. Now I cannot find that God made this Dispo-

Disposition of the Powers in the Kingdom of Great Britain, but our Ancestors ordain'd that thus it should be. Besides, by the Powers which are ordain'd by God, cannot be meant the Persons of the Magistrates who bear Authority in this Nation, or are vested with any part of the Powers before-mention'd. I own that God made all the Men, and Women too, who are in Authority; but I mean that God ordain'd no Family nor single Person to bear Rule over us in any sort of Trust, or committed to any Person any superiour or inferiour Magistracy in this Kingdom. I my self can remember when the Convention of the Estates of England gave the sole Administration of the Supreme Magistracy of England to the Prince of Orange, without so much as asking leave of the Princess his Highness's Consort: nor was it material whether she consented or not. Nor did God chuse the Members of the Commons House, who join'd with the Lords in making that Disposal of the Crown; tho he gave the Freeholders of England the Wisdom to make so good a Choice. So that the Sovereign Power of that Supreme Magistrate was (as Ben says) deriv'd to him from the Aggregate Body of the People, as by their Grant and Concession. And I hope that this is no Contradiction to St. Paul, till the Bishop shall shew the Sense of the Apostle to the contrary. But if the Bishop shall studiously avoid to declare his own Sense of St. Paul's words, which he has oppos'd to Ben's plain intelligible Doctrine, and shall only set forth the words of that Apostle in contradiction to that Doctrine or Position (as he calls it) which was exemplify'd by the late happy Revolution; what does he do but only make a Cat's Foot of the 13th of the Romans? St. Paul may burn his fingers, but the Bishop is too wise for that.

But perhaps you will say, That tho the Bishop will not explain the Apostle, yet he is free enough to declare his own Belief of the Institution of Civil Government, both before, and soon after Noah's Flood. Pag. 33. says he, *I believe the first Man who was Father, as likewise Civil Governour of all his Children. He had, I verily believe, as much Power of a Civil Governour, as any King has now: And I believe the same of Noah afterwards.* And this he proves from these words; *Whoever sheds Man's Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed.* Which Command of God (says he) either instituted a Civil Government, or supposes it already settled: For who but the Civil Magistrate could judicially put to death a Murderer? And who could be the Civil Magistrate but Noah? And if a Civil Government were settled so soon, I think I may conclude that it has continu'd ever since; having not been intermitted, unless perhaps sometimes by a prevailing-Rebellion. Now I will tell you what I believe; which is, 1. That the Text cited by the Bishop is not an Institution of any Civil Government: for many more things are necessary to institute a Civil Government, than to slay a Murderer. 2. I believe that the Bishop cannot shew that there was any Civil Government instituted at that time: Mankind might then be in Ben's Wilderness State, for all that he can prove to the contrary; and yet an Avenger of Blood might be found out even in that State. And, 3. That Noah was ever a Civil Governour, I will give him leave to believe as long as he will, and to prove when he is able. And, 4. I believe that Ben is not bound to take the Bishop's bare Word for the Civil Authority of King Noah; because in the Serene Republick of Letters no Bishop's Authority was ever admitted as Proof, but

but every Man's Reasons only were weigh'd in the balance, and upon the turning of the Scale the Senate pass'd Judgment.

Having now satisfy'd my self, by the Assistance of our made Lawyer, about the Original of Civil Government, I proceeded to inquire after the other great Point in hand between the Bishop and Ben, concerning the Lawfulness of Resistance. And because this was a Point of Religion, and that one may be damn'd for want of true understanding of the matter, I consulted our old made Parson (not Ben) upon the point; and ask'd him what sort of Resistance that was which amounted to Rebellion, and hazarded our Salvation. Sa'd he, I have learnt from a Great Prophet, who was an old Mosaiical Bishop, for he was the Director and Governour of a great People, that *Rebellion is as the Sin of Witchcraft*. Here is a Comparison (sa'd he) which will explain this matter: for as Witchcraft is utterly unaccountable, so is Rebellion. For can it be conceiv'd, that the good God should give to an old Woman a power to plague her Neighbour's innocent Children and dumb Cattel, only to satisfy her Malice against her innocent Neighbour? And can it be conceiv'd, that a Body of People, being in the ordinary Use of their Wits, should rise and join themselves together, to plague their lawfull Governours, who discharge their Offices according to Justice and Equity? If Governours turn to be Tyrants, our Bishop himself will not gain-say Self-defence, tho he does not much care to approve of it. So that he has not as yet condemn'd that Self-defence to be a damnable Rebellion. Now laying these Considerations together, I believe the Matter may be brought to this issue: He who believes that there have been few Witches, will believe as few Rebellions; and he who believes that there was never any Witch in the Notion as we have now of a Witch, will not easily be brought to believe, that there was ever any Rebellion of Men in their Wits against an honest and just Administration. As for our People of *South-Britain*, they have ever had a great Mixture of Passive Obedience in their Good-nature, and did never attempt to throw off the Yoke, till their Necks were gall'd to the quick, as our Historys will bear them witness. And methinks 'tis a sorry Compliment to a Supreme Magistrate, to preach up such a Doctrine, or even to make such Insinuations as must lay People under a necessity to repeat the Faults of that Magistrate's Ancestors, in order to vindicate themselves from such a damnable Sin, as they think was never committed by them. But perhaps you will alledge in the Bishop's defence, that he does not condemn our late Self-defence, nor yet approve of it. What! did the People of *England* neither Well nor Ill in joining the Prince of *Orange*, as then was, in order to defend themselves from Popery and Slavery, which were rushing in as a Torrent upon them? I have heard, that it is a Question in the *Quodlibets*, Whether he who will not eat a Piece of the Devil, may be permitted to sup of the Broth which the Devil is boil'd in? and our Schoolmen have held it in the Negative. Now 'twas Resistance which brought about the late happy Revolution, which preserv'd the Church of *England*, and the Bishoprick of *Exeter* in the first place: What pity 'tis, that a Bishop of *Exeter* should not own the Revolution-Principle!

In sober sadness, 'twere to be wish'd that the Clergy of the Church of *England*, who are as learned and able in their Profession as any in *Christendom*,

dom, being througly skill'd in the Languages wherein the Holy Scriptures were originally written, and also in all antient Histories and Customs to which the Jewish Dispensation relates, and whereunto the Writers of the New Testament allude; being also well seen in General History, Oratory, Philosophy, and all other polite and learned Accomplishments, fitting them for the Discharge of their high Calling, in a manner worthy of all Acceptation. I were heartily to be wish'd (as I was saying) that their Politicks had never given offence to very many Men, who are truly Lovers of their Country: and 'twas unfortunate, that the whole Body of the Clergy did not give in to the late Revolution. But yet I could not chuse but pity such of them, who by virtue of the Principles which they receiv'd in their Education, were prevented from owning the Rightfulness of King William's Title to the Crown of England, and from swearing Allegiance to him: since every Man's Conscience is form'd by his Education. and these Clergymen were bred up in the indefeasible Rights of Kings, and in Passive Obedience to the worst of Tyrants. And I pity'd them the more, because the Civil Power does still seem to give countenance to these Doctrines, by continuing the Authority of the Book of Homilies. Nor can it be said, that Clergymen may excuse themselves wholly from the Study of Politicks, and give themselves up intirely to the Study of Religion and Practice of Devotion, which perhaps would best become them; since the 30th of January and 29th of May, are visible Encouragements to the Clergy, not only to deal in Politicks, but in such Politicks which seemingly are not of a-piece with the Revolution-Principle. But all this notwithstanding, since the fifth Day of November is by Authority appointed to return Thanks to God for our late happy Revolution, I humbly suppose that this may justify Brother Ben, or any Clergyman, in owning and asserting the Principle upon which that Revolution was form'd. But if it should be so, that the Scheme of January Politicks should really be contradictory to the Scheme of November, 'tis no wonder that there should be bickerings between Bishops and Priests, as long as these tow Systems continue; for since some Men cannot receive both of them, every one is left at liberty to chuse for himself: and certainly every sensible Man will adhere to that Scheme, by which his Religion and Property have been

been so lately preserv'd. To tack both these Schemes together, is to plow with an Ox and an Ass, in the Opinion of some People: and, generally speaking, no Clergymen were so ill thought of by Men of Probity, as such who in the last Reign swore Allegiance to the King, and yet coul not forbear to shew their dislike to his Title; they would accept of Preferments from him, without acknowledging that he came rightfully by the Power to dispose of them. They own'd only his *Defect of Ship* in the Administration, and desir'd only to have his Preferments in fact, not troubling themselves to inquire whether they came rightfully by them. Nay some envy'd him that very *Defect of Ship*, and rejoic'd at the *French* Successes against him. In short, this sort of People were never much esteem'd, at least, as I may say, in the Country.

For Brother Tom, it has been generally agreed in the Country, that every body should praise the Bridge he goes over; and therefore it was thought by honest Men, that they who receiv'd Benefits from that King, should have behav'd themselves otherwise towards him. Indeed Times are mended: for none of our Bishops Texts have enter'd any Protestation against her Majesty's Title; as nine Lords did against the rightful Title of King *William* the Third, when a Bill was sent from the Commons to the Lords to enact the same. One of those Lords too had accepted a very good Bishoprick from that King: so that if one was not rightful King, the other could not be rightful Bishop. This was the Madness of some in the late Reign; but now Men are grown wiser. No body protests against her Majesty's Title, tho grounded on the Revolution Act of Parliament; only the late happy Revolution was form'd upon such an unlucky Principle, that some great Men are ashamed to own it, tho they will not openly discredit it. Prithee Brother Tom, try to reconcile the Bishop to Brother Ben, upon this grand Point of Resistance. Tell him, that Ben allows of no Resistance, but such as is necessary to preserve the Church of *England* and State too by Law establish'd. Tell him, that the People of *Great Britain* will never be encourag'd by Ben, or any other Person, to venture hanging, unless it be when the Religion and Propertys of themselves and their Posterity, which are more worth than their Necks, are in imminent Danger. Tell him, that if he will not give them leave to defend them-

themselves, 'tis a hundred to one but in such a Case they will take leave. Tell him, that if he will not explain himself upon that Point, now he has meddled with it, some People will think that he dislikes the Liberty which the People took in a late Reign, and which the Parliament also justify'd by joining with it; and consequently that the Act of Settlement, by which her gracious Majesty now reigns, may want sufficient Authority. This I believe was all that *Ben* meant to charge upon his Lordship, not supposing that he would be so unwary as to say any words against the Queen's Majesty. All that can be said with Justice is, that since the Bishop is so very cautious in owning the Revolution, some People, as wary as he, may, being led by so great an Authority as his Character gives him, discard the Revolution-Principle, and the Revolution it self, and all that depends upon it. Perhaps some may from hence take an occasion to inform the Illustrious House of Hanover, that the Bishops, who in their Letters congratulated the Succession of that House to the Throne of England, when it was enacted, were not in good earnest. Others may, from the Bishop's Notions, suppose that House not very safe in their Succession. I am sure most People think that this Kingdom is not safe without their Succession. And if the Bishop's great Caution should be drawn into an Example, who shall defend the Succession by Law establish'd against the Pretender, if he should oppose it?

For my part I cannot see why any Man should be so cautious, so cold and reserv'd in owning the Revolution. If the Principle thereof be drop'd at this time, and shall grow out of fashion, I am sure we are likely to have mad doings in Great Britain. I remember the time when many People were not afraid of a Popish Successor; but now all People know what they must expect in such a Case. 'Tis generally agreed, that a Wolf is not fit to keep Sheep, nor a Popish Prince to rule over Protestant People: and in this Case he who is not with us, is against us; he who will not keep the Wolf out of the Flock, is willing to admit him. An honest Dutchman will maintain the Banks, which have kept the Sea from overflowing his Country; but he would be a strange sort of a Dutchman, who should affect to carry himself with indifferency in a matter of that Importance, who would not so much as approve of keeping up the Banks, with the great Pains-taking and Hazard of the

the Labourers ; who will not say 'twas well done of them to bring their Baskets of Earth and Stone to mend the decaying Banks, and keep out the overflowing Tide which is making a furious Inroad into their Territorys. But on the other hand, you will say, that this *Dutchman* does not condemn his Countrymen for their Pains-taking upon that occasion. 'Tis true, I own it, that he cannot for shame exclaim against them, because they sav'd his House and Lands from the Deluge which was coming on ; neither will he commend 'em, or give 'em encouragement to the same at another time, when for some private Reasons, perhaps, he would be contented to fish in troubled Waters. If *Vendome* and *Villars* liv'd in *Holland*, would they behave themselves any otherwise, tho they wish'd the Country under Water (themselves only excepted) that it might be no longer a diminution to their Master's Glory ?

Much like this it is, to be so indifferent to the Principle of the late Revolution. 'Tis a nice new Air, to be indifferent to a *happy* Revolution, for so the Bishop stiles it. The not inquiring whether we came honestly by this Revolution or not, is to be cold and indifferent in a matter of the greatest consequence as ever befel the Kingdom. 'Tis very pretty not to own or disown the means whereby this happy Revolution was brought to pass. So have I heard of an *Irish* Colonel (and a very good Catholick he was) who being ask'd concerning the Health of a certain Captain belonging to his Regiment, made this Answer ; *viz.* Yesterday I was told that he was dead, but this Morning I heard that he was alive, but for my part I believe neither of the Reports. Surely 'tis some profound Policy which keeps some Men so much upon the Reserve. A time may come, if God prevent it not of his Mercy, when the Revolution-Principle must be damn'd to the bottom of the bottomless Pit. 'Tis time enough then for a wise Man to declare himself. But how will he justify himself in calling the Revolution *happy* ? Truly he may say, according to the old Proverb, *Happy be lucky* ; it prov'd very lucky to him. Yet still he may plead that he never justified the Principle which procur'd it, but always carry'd himself at least indifferently towards it, and could not help the Success and Settlement whic attended it. Call up all this Brother *Tom*, and see if it does not amount to a detestable Neutrality.

g
s,
us
ill
or
at
his
ei-
he
s,
ne
ny
es
eir

he
py
ce-
old
oe-
the
So
ick
ap-
er-
he
Su-
ach
his
the
wife
ing
old
stil
ur'
and
Cal
de